

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

G&G Closed Circuit Events LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

Jose O Diaz, et al.,

Defendants.

No. CV-22-01837-PHX-JZB

ORDER

This matter was assigned to Magistrate Judge John Z. Boyle. On January 24, 2025, the Magistrate Judge filed a Report and Recommendation with this Court.¹ (Doc. 68). The Magistrate Judge recommends that the Court grant the Plaintiff's Motion for Attorney Fees and Costs. (Doc. 56). To date, no objections have been filed.

I. STANDARD OF REVIEW

¹ This case is assigned to a Magistrate Judge. However, not all parties have consented to the jurisdiction of the Magistrate Judge. Thus, the matter is before this Court pursuant to General Order 21-25, which states in relevant part:

When a United States Magistrate Judge to whom a civil action has been assigned pursuant to Local Rule 3.7(a)(1) considers dismissal to be appropriate but lacks the jurisdiction to do so under 28 U.S.C. § 636(c)(1) due to incomplete status of election by the parties to consent or not consent to the full authority of the Magistrate Judge,

IT IS ORDERED that the Magistrate Judge will prepare a Report and Recommendation for the Chief United States District Judge or designee.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED designating the following District Court Judges to review and, if deemed suitable, to sign the order of dismissal on my behalf:

Phoenix/Prescott: Senior United States District Judge Stephen M. McNamee

The Court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); see Baxter v. Sullivan, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991). Parties have fourteen days from the service of a copy of the Magistrate’s recommendation within which to file specific written objections to the Court. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 6, 72. Failure to object to a Magistrate Judge’s recommendation relieves the Court of conducting *de novo* review of the Magistrate Judge’s factual findings and waives all objections to those findings on appeal. See Turner v. Duncan, 158 F.3d 449, 455 (9th Cir. 1998). A failure to object to a Magistrate Judge’s conclusion “is a factor to be weighed in considering the propriety of finding waiver of an issue on appeal.” Id.

II. DISCUSSION

Having reviewed the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, and no Objections having been made by any party thereto, the Court hereby incorporates and adopts the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation.


III. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, for the reasons set forth,

IT IS ORDERED granting Plaintiff’s Motion for Award of Attorneys’ Fees. (Doc. 56).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED awarding Plaintiff \$22,731.75 for attorney fees and \$2,516.70 in costs, against Defendant Mariscos El Tiburon, LLC

Dated this 28th day of February, 2025.


 Stephen M. McNamee
 Senior United States District Judge